MARVIN 97893:07-CVE02380-JEH High Leert state PRISON P.O. BOX 3020, D-7-125

IN PRO-PCR

SUSANVILLE, CA, 96127

Document 21

Filed 03/26/2008

Page 1 of 6

FILED

MAR 2 6 2008

RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

united States northern District court

MARVIN G. HOLLIS, PLAINTIFF
VS.
ELOY MEDINA,

Defendant

NIC

CASE NO: C-07-2980 - TEH-IPRI

"Opposition" to Defendant's motion
to stay Discovery pending motion to
dismiss and motion FOR gradified

Immunity, And Regest FOR Exstention
of time to file opposition
to defendant's motion to DISMISS AND
motion FOR GRALIFIED IMMUNITY.

TO defendant ELOY medina:

Please take notice plaintiff moves the court to deny defendant motion to stay discovery pending motion to dismiss and motion FOR qualified Immunity, and request FOR exstention of time to file apposition to defendant's motion to dismiss and motion FOR qualified Immunity to And Including April 22, 2008 In which to file such apposition.

Defendant's motion is off point thus has some basis IN FACT. The privilege of GLALIFIED IMMUNITY IS AN IMMUNITY FROM SLIT RATHER THAN A MERE JEFENSE to LIABILITY. A RULING should be made EARLY IN the proceedings so that the cost and expenses of trial ARE Avoided where the defense Is dispositive. Such Immunity Is an entitlement not to stand trial, not A defense from Liability. Mitchell V. FORSYTH 472 U.S. 511,526, W5 S. Ct. 2806, 86 L. Erl. 2d 411. Defendant angue that he is entitled to qualified immunity. This Argument must be rejected based on the pappers, LAWS, AND FILES PROPERLY BEFORE the COURT IN Addition that qualified Immunity IS ONLY AN IMMUNITY FROM A SLIT FOR JAMAGES AND LIVES NOT PROVICE IMPUNITY From suit for declaratory or Injunctive relief. (LOS ANGELES PULICE PROTECTIVE LEAGUE V. GATES 995 F.2d 1469.1472 (9th CIR. 11993). Defendant Instead argue that he is entitled to yurlified immunity from ALL OF plaintiff's claims to the extent that plaintiff seeks monetar' damages despite that praintiff asso seeks declaratory and injunctive relief.

IF defendants motion to stay discovery Is granted It will affect my ability and obstruct me from gathering Information and evidence to oppose defendant motion to dismiss and motion FOR qualified Immunity, thus defendant Is not entitled to gradified Immunity cause the LANS were clearly established and his actions were Not REASUNABLE IN Light of the circumstances he confronted nor has defendant demonstrated what administrative remedy remained avalible to plaintiff once his appeal was rejected by PRISON Authorit's which was timed submitted. (SAUCIER V. KATZ 121 S.Ct. 2151, 5330.5-194 (2001) * (Booth v. churner 532 U.S. 731, 121 s.ct. 1819 (2001))* * (civil Rights of Institutionalized persons act # 7/2) * 42 U.S.C.A. 1997 C(2).)

Plaintiff need such discovery to demonstrate to the court that his administrative remedy was IN Fact exhausted under the Authority of (Brown. V. VALOFF 422 F.32) 926 (9th Cir. 2005)) and

other Federal Law as plaintiff was Informed by PRISON OFFICIALS RELIABLY that NO Remedies are AVALLABLE. (See BROWN V. VALOFF 422 F. 3d 926(9th cir. 12005) Plaintiff have some discover's and evidence but need such regested discovery to Adequate / Litigate this case. Plaintiff New points out to the court that defendant declaration in support of his motion to stay discovery should be dismissed and not considered by the court as defendant declared that the declaration was executed on march 10, 2006 two 121 Years prior to the date the motion to stal discovery was filled and IN conflict with the JECLARATION OF SERVICE Which ASO cite the wrong case number as being served march 11,2008. ON march 2,2008 praintiff submitted A motion to stay the proceedings and motion to compel discovery. Desendant has fixed A motion to stay discovery. IN order to file A Adequate effective a opposition to defendant mution to dismiss and motion FOR CX ALIFICAL

Immunity, plaintiff will need the requested discuery. The Information sought IS my (COC3R) 602 Appeals RECORDS AND INFORMATION Which WILL Show NO administrative remedy remained avaliable and my questions IN my Interrogatories Is needed so I can prove defendant is not entitled to QUALIFIER IMMUNITY OR SUMMANY JUdgment and that his motion to dismiss and gentified Immenity should be dismissed. MARGOLIS V.RYAN 140 F.3d 850, 853 9th cir. 11998) and (Nicholas V. WALLENSTEIN 266 F-3cl 1083, 1088-89 (9th CIR. 2001).

FOR the foregoing reasons and for good cause, I Respectfully Request that defendant motion to STAY discovery be deviced and that plaintiff be granted a exstention & of time to file A opposition to defendant motion to dismiss and MOTION FOR CHALIFIED IMMUNITY TO AND INCLUDING APRIL 22, 2008. Respectfully submitted, Murrin Glern Hollis

-PLAINTIFF -

Dated: 3-17-02

DECLARATIONS"

CASENO. 1-107-2980-TEH-(PR)

I declare as Exhans,

And demed legal materials and plato copling services and has been unable to study and research to prepare my apposition to defendant motion to dismiss and motion to prepare my apposition.

3.) I had to hand write a copy of the opposition to defendant motion of the opposition to defendant motion of time, as well as this deciseration due to being deviced in Library services and materials and In write to consider I had to write defendant copy small to fit on 2 pages instead of 5 pages to fit inside a business size envelope due to me being deviced legal size envelope due to me being deviced legal size.

3.) I have pending appeals at 3rd Level Legth HOSP-5-07-04164 and (HOSP) and Requesting access to a LAW LIBRARY and No root know If relief will be provided or when I will be scheduled for LAW LIBRARY Access or provided Legge

materials.

I declare under penalty of persony the Porcycling Is true and connect. Executed this 19 day of march Door at suscentially of Minoria selemptices.

NC

NC

MAR 2 6 2008